

Response to Official Action
Dated 6 August 2007
Re: USSN 10/677,863
Page 2

Drawing Amendment

Please replace figure 3 of the application with the amended version thereof attached hereto. In the amended version the legend "Prior Art" has been added thereto.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Figure 3

Figure 3 has been amended to add the legend "Prior Art" thereto as required by the Examiner.

35 USC § 101 Rejections

Claims 10 and 11 have been amended to more clearly recite a method. A method is statutory under 35 USC § 101.

Claims 12 -14 have been amended to recite that the instructions are "stored on computer readable media" which is believe to fully address this rejection.

Claims 15 and 16 are cancelled without prejudice or the rejection of them at this time is moot.

Prior Art Rejections based on Moritani

Claims 10-16 and 19-21 were rejected as allegedly being fully anticipated by US Patent 6,415,115 to Moritani. This grounds for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10 and 11

Claim 10 has been amended to more clearly recite a method as mentioned above. Nevertheless, claim 10 both as originally presented and in its amended form clearly differentiates itself from Moritani. Moreover it is respectfully noted that the Examiner provided no rationale for rejecting claims 10 and 11 based on Moritani. This is improper. The rejection fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.104 and the official action is incomplete.

In the rejection of claim 12, the Examiner points to column 5, lines 25-26 & 31-37 and also to figure 1 of Moritani. At the places indicated at column 5 of Moritani, there is disclosure of a "printing table" which is stores as a file which the Examiner reads on the word "instruction". Apparently this file helps in printing out "received image information". This is explained in greater detail at column 6, lines 16-22 of Moritani. In any event, the Examiner, noting at the received image information is printed asserts that "the image information get printer according to the received instruction information." That is well and fine, but with all due respect, that observation does not have much at all to do with the claim language other than to make it more than clear that claim 10 differentiates itself from Moritani.

Claim 10 included the recitation "user information data, describing instructions to a human user for orientation of a set of media sheets for entry into a printer device." [emphasis added]

Moritani's instructions are used within the computer and there is no disclosure in the cited portion of Moritani of either "user information data, describing instructions to a human user for orientation of a set of media sheets for entry into a printer device" as recited originally in claim 10 or of "providing instructions to a human user in a form of information data printed by said printer device and describing instructions to a the human user for orientation of a set of media sheets for entry into said printer device" in the more methody version of this limitation in amended claim 10.

The rejections of claims 10 and 11 are both procedurally defective and improper on the merits.

Claims 12-14

Claim 12 as originally filed included the limitation "instructions specifying an orientation for entering a set of media sheets into an input tray of a printer device". While Moritani may have instructions, those instructions go to the printer rather than to a human user thereof and therefore do not include "instructions specifying an orientation for entering a set of media sheets into an input tray of a printer device". Nevertheless, claim 12 has been slightly amended (and broadened somewhat in the process). Claim 12, as amended, recites:

"a component for generating user instructions describing to a user of said print system an orientation for entering a set of media sheets into an input tray of a printer device for printing a print job; and
a component for automatically activating printing of said user instructions prior to completion of printing of said print job on said media sheets"

which clearly differentiates claim 12 from Moritani. Claim 12 is patentable over Moritani.

Dependent claims 13 and 14 are also patentable over Moritani.

Claim 19

Claim 19, as originally presented, includes the limitation "printing instructions for handling of said plurality of sheets of media". The Examiner points the applicant to column 6, lines 16-22 of Moritani, which indicates that the "received image information" ... "is read out in an order represented by the table" But where does Moritani disclose any printing of the table (which the examiner apparently reads on the instructions limitation, as discussed above)?

A new dependent claim 22 has been added which specifically indicates that the instructions are “printed in a human-readable form on sheet media by said printer device”.

Claim 20

Claim 20 includes the limitation “sending a user instruction for instructing a user to manipulate at least one media sheet at said printer device”. The Examiner asserts that this limitation is taught in Moritani at column 7, lines 4-8. With all due respect to the Examiner, the cited passage does not teach “sending a user instruction for instructing a user to manipulate at least one media sheet at said printer device”. While the printing might get done on the fed sheets, how does that meet the limitation?

Claim 21

Claim 21, as examined, included the limitation “receiving a user instruction for instructing a user to manipulate at least one media sheet at said printer device” which clearly differentiates claim 21 from Moritani. This limitation in claim 21 as amended now recites “receiving a user readable instruction instructing a user to manipulate at least one media sheet at said printer device” which continues to distinguish this claim from Moritani.

Prior Art Rejections based on Maniwa

Claims 10-11 and 17-18 were rejected as allegedly being fully anticipated by US Patent 5,731,879 to Maniwa. This grounds for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10 and 11

Claim 10 has been amended to more clearly recite a method as mentioned above. Nevertheless, claim 10 both as originally presented and in its amended form clearly differentiates itself from Maniwa.

Claim 10, as amended, recites "providing instructions to a human user in a form of information data printed by said printer device and describing instructions to a the human user for orientation of a set of media sheets for entry into said printer device". The passage cited by the Examiner, namely column 12, lines 17-25, of Maniwa is irrelevant to this limitation.

Claims 17-18

Claim 17, as amended, recites:

"printing first sides of a set of print media sheets; and
printing a set of user instructions describing to a user how to enter said set of printed print media sheets into a printer device for printing second sides of said media sheets"

which clearly differentiates claim 17 from Maniwa. Claim 17 is patentable over Moritani. The passages cited by the Examiner (column 12, lines 44-45 and 58-66) is silent with respect to the limitations of claim 17. The rejection is improper.

Prior Art Rejections based on Moritani and Maniwa

Claims 1-9 were rejected as allegedly being fully obvious over US Patent 5,731,879 to Maniwa in view of US Patent 6,415,115 to Moritani. This grounds for rejection is respectfully traversed.

On page 10 of the official action the Examiner asserts that "Moritani teaches printing a set of instructions (column 5, lines 21-27; note that the instructions from a user terminal get printed)."

With all due respect to the Examiner, Moritani teaches no such thing. The passage cited by the Examiner is reproduced below:

"Upon occurrence of an event representing the presence of a printing instruction from a user terminal connected through a communication cable or the like (S11), a SYSTEM-CPU 21 of an interface control electrical unit 20 processes image information which is received via a unit I/F and includes single-side/double-side printing information at the header (S12)."

This passage does not suggest or state that the "instructions" get printed. In the cited paragraph of Moritani the printing instruction apparently only controls how the "image information" gets printed. Moritani does not meet the limitation noted above. So Examiner's reliance on Moritani is misplaced and the rejection is improper.

Furthermore, the justification for combining Moritani and Maniwa fails to meet the test for an obviousness rejection as set forth by the Supreme Court in the KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. case. It is believed that the USPTO has issued Examination Guidelines for making an obviousness type rejection and the Examiner's analysis, besides misconstruing the prior art, utterly fails to follow what the USPTO would consider to be a properly reasoned rejection under 35 USC § 103.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2125. In

particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2125.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

September 20, 2007
(Date of Transmission)

Richard Berg
(Name of Person Transmitting)


(Signature)

September 20, 2007
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Richard P. Berg
Attorney for the Applicant
Reg. No. 28,145
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Boulevard,
Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90036
(323) 934-2300 voice
(323) 934-0202 facsimile

Enclosures:

Amended Figure 3

Post card